1	The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was n	
2	for publication and is not binding precedent of the Boar	a
3	AD HATED OT A TEO DATENIT AND TO A DEMANDIZ C	CEICE
4	UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK C	FFICE
5	• ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
6	DEPODE THE DOADD OF DATENT ADDEAD	C
7	BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEAL	رم م
8	AND INTERFERENCES	
9		
10	En monto MI OOM DADM IN ELING MIM	BGALLED
11	Ex parte KI-OOK PARK, IN-EUNG KIM IN-SEOP JEONG and TAE-SEOK PARK	MAILED
12	IN-SEOF JEONG and TAE-SEOR TARK	cco 1 9 2007
13 14		FEB 1 2 2007
15	Appeal 2007-0112	U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
16	Reissue Application 09/892,790 ¹	AND INTERFERENCES
17	Patent 5,917,679	
18	Technology Center 2600	
19	2001	
20		
21	Oral Argument: None ²	
22	Decided: February 12, 2007	
23	·	
24		
25	Before: FRED E. McKELVEY, Senior Administrative Paten	<i>t Judge</i> , and
26	HOWARD B. BLANKENSHIP and ALLEN R. MacDONAL	
27	Administrative Patent Judges.	
28	_	
29	McKELVEY, Senior Administrative Patent Judge.	
30		

Reissue application filed 28 June 2001 seeking to reissue U.S. Patent 5,917,679, granted 29 June 1999, based on application 08/915,342 filed 22 August 1997. The real party in interest is SamSung Electronics Co., Ltd.

² Oral argument was scheduled for 21 February 2007. In preparing for oral argument, it became apparent that further action by the Examiner was required. Accordingly, oral argument was cancelled, counsel for Appellants being notified by phone 6 February 2007 of the cancellation.

1 2 2	MEMORANDUM OPINION and ORDER Limited Remand
3	A. Statement of the case
5	The appeal is from a decision of the Examiner rejecting claims 21,
6	30-32 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being "clearly anticipated" by
7	Nepela, U.S. Patent 5,568,981, issued 29 October 1996 based on an
8	application filed 10 April 1995.
9	Nepela is prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).
10	In the answer, the Examiner states (page 4):
11 12 13	Note figure 5c. NEPELA et al shows a negative pressure slider with a U-shaped air bearing platform (108) defining a negative pressure cavity (not numbered—the area between the two rear extending legs of the U), the U-shaped air bearing
15	platform having a cross rail portion (not numbered) and not
16 17	more than two separate air bearing platforms (not numbered—the rear extending legs) which terminate before the rear edge of
1 / 18	the slider, the not more than two separate air bearing platforms
19	have side wall portions (not numbered), and a centered rear air
20 21	bearing platform (120) which mounts a transducer.
22	B. Discussion
23	We start out with the observation that it is not readily apparent to us
24	how claims 21, 30-32 and 41 are "clearly anticipated" by Nepela. Nor are
25	we sure if there is a difference is between "clearly anticipated" and
26	"anticipated."
27	The Examiner, however, believes the claims on appeal are anticipated.
28	The Examiner no doubt is considerably more knowledgeable about the art
29	than we are. Furthermore, because of that knowledge, the Examiner may
30	have been inclined to make justified assumptions about the scope and
31	content of Nepela which we are unable to appreciate.

Appeal 2007-0112 Application 09/892,790

1	We would appreciate further input from the Examiner on precisely
2	how the Examiner sees the claims on appeal to be anticipated. Most
3	respectfully, we ask the Examiner to reproduce each of the claims on appeal
4	and after each claim limitation insert a reference to the drawing element and
5	specification (by column and lines) so that we can better appreciate how the
6	Examiner believes that all the limitations of the claims are described by
7	Nepela.
8	We call the Examiner's attention to Ex parte Braeken, 54 USPQ2d
9	1110 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1999), for a suggested format to be followed.
10	With respect to claim 21 on appeal, the Examiner may use the following
11	format:
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	21. A negative pressure air bearing slider (col, line; Fig, element _) having a negative pressure cavity (col, line; Fig, element _), comprising: a body with a principal surface (col, line; Fig, element _) disposed to confront a recording surface (col, line; Fig, element _) of a recording medium (col, line; Fig, element _), said principal surface having a lead portion (col, line; Fig, element _) and a rear portion (col, line; Fig, element _) and a rear portion direction (col, line; Fig, element _) of any recording medium confronted by said slider, said lead portion having a front edge (col, line; Fig, element _), said rear portion having a rear edge (col, line; Fig, element _), said front edge and said rear edge together defining boundaries (col.
28 29 30 31	, line; Fig, element) of said principal surface in a longitudinal direction (col, line; Fig, element) of said slider body; and

Appeal 2007-0112 Application 09/892,790

1	a U-shaped air bearing platform (col, line; Fig,
2	element _) defining a negative pressure cavity (col, line;
3	Fig, element _) on said principal surface (col, line;
4	Fig, element _), said U-shaped air bearing platform
5	comprising not more than two separate air bearing platforms
6	(col, line; Fig, element _) each extending rearwardly
7	(col, line; Fig, element _) toward said rear portion of
8	said principal surface and respectively terminating (col, line
9	; Fig, element _) at a first rear termination (col, line;
10	Fig, element _) and a second rear termination (col, line
11	; Fig, element _), at least one of said not more than two
12	separate air bearing platforms including a side wall portion (col.
13	, line; Fig, element _);
14	
15	at least one of said first rear termination and said second
16	rear termination not coinciding (col, line; Fig, element
17	with said rear edge, and being disposed upstream (col,
18	line; Fig, element _) of said rear edge relative to said
19	rotational direction (col, line; Fig, element _) of said
20	recording medium.
21	
22	The Examiner may use a similar format for the other four claims on
23	appeal. Based on the Examiner's discussion in the answer, it may be that
24	certain elements of the claims on appeal are not numbered in the drawings.
25	The Examiner should feel free to reproduce a copy of any relevant figure of
26	the drawings and add numbers to elements not otherwise numbered and
27	include a copy of the drawing with the response to this remand.
28	We appreciate the fact that this remand is the second remand to the
29	Examiner, the first having to do with a recapture rejection which the
30	Examiner has withdrawn. However, where possible, a proper decision on
31	the merits is to be achieved and we are confident we will be able to better

Appeal 2007-0112 Application 09/892,790

1	appreciate how Nepela is believed to anticipate the claims after we receive
2	what we expect will be valuable input from the Examiner.
3 4	C. Order
5	Upon consideration of the record on appeal, and for the reasons given,
6	it is
7	ORDERED that the appeal is remanded to the Examiner for
8	action not inconsistent with views expressed in this opinion.
9	FURTHER ORDERED that except as otherwise expressly
10	provided herein, the Board retains jurisdiction over the appeal.
11	FURTHER ORDERED that within one (1) month of the date
12	the Examiner enters a response to this remand, Appellants may file a paper
13	(not to exceed 10 pages) addressing the Examiner's response.
14	FURTHER ORDERED that oral argument scheduled for
15	21 February 2007 is cancelled and will be reset in due course.
16	FURTHER ORDERED that, unless otherwise ordered, the
17	provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) (2006) are not applicable to further
18	proceedings involving the application on appeal.
19 20 21	McK/lp
22 23	cc (via First Class Mail):
24 25 26 27	Robert E. Bushnell, Esq. 1522 "K" Street, N.W., Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20005
28	Tel: 202-408-9040